

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY
REMARKS TO PRESS TRAVELING WITH SECRETARY
MOSCOW, RUSSIA
MARCH 18, 1994

SECRETARY PERRY: A few introductory comments. We had very good meetings in the last two days with the Defense Minister, and then again today, Mr. Grachev has already gone off on a trip so we met with the Deputy Defense Minister and the Chief of the General Staff, with the Foreign Minister yesterday, Prime Minister today. Met with the Duma yesterday, too. All of these have been very productive, very useful discussions.

The principal items under discussion were ways of reducing weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical, biological weapons. We discussed the Partnership for Peace. We were advocating Russia joining. Russia has announced its intention to join and that they will have their proposal into NATO by the end of the month. And we had detailed discussions on defense conversion. We had a commission meeting yesterday afternoon and this morning reaching agreements on how to proceed on defense conversion and the Russians and I will be signing an agreement this afternoon that marks the next phase of that program. It's going to get us started off with real programs, real action in this field of defense conversion in the weeks ahead.

That's a quick summary of the things we've been doing, things we've been talking about. We'll go to questions now.

Q. I wanted to ask if you could sum up briefly what was accomplished in the area of defense conversion. Is this just a small step on a long road or, what kind of strides do you think were made in this meeting?

SECRETARY PERRY: What we have been doing in this commission in defense conversion up to this point have been working out the detailed agreements of what it was we were going to do. These are joint programs. They involve Russian government, U.S. government. They involve Russian companies and U.S. companies, as well as people from a lot of institutions. Up until now we've been getting the agreements nailed down for proceeding. The agreement that I sign this afternoon will be the final step in that process and what we'll be doing from here on in is initiating projects. So this is a real landmark today.

One way way of putting it is up until now we've been talking about defense conversion, from here on in we're going to be acting on it. We'll have joint business partnerships formed between Russian companies and American companies. We'll have a prefabricated housing industry get started here in Russia. We'll see houses being built. We'll see business partnerships actually building new commercial products. So in the weeks ahead we're going to see the action that is the payoff to all of these discussions and agreements we've reached up to this point.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how is defense conversion in Russia different than defense conversion in the United States. Is it harder? Is it easier and why?

SECRETARY PERRY: Yes, it's both harder and easier. It's harder because the infrastructure which start-up companies need here, new businesses need here, the infrastructure is lacking in many important respects, particularly the financial infrastructure. But in other respects, it's very much easier in that the competition in the commercial products either doesn't exist at all or at least is not as fierce. American companies when they're American defense companies trying to break in to commercial businesses are immediately confronted with world class competition in everything they're doing. So they not only have to develop a first class product, but they have to be immediately competitive twice. And we don't have that same situation here today in Russia, and so from that point of view and it's a very fundamentally important point of view, if a Russian defense company can succeed in developing a good product useful here both in Russia and in other countries, it can immediately start selling those products.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the Partnership for Peace, realizing that Russia has sent rather strong signals in recent weeks, maybe even months, that they would join, how would you describe your reaction to it? Is it belief, ecstasy? I mean I'm sure it was the feeling in NATO that the Partnership for Peace badly, badly needed Russia to join and put its imprint on it? How do you feel about it?

SECRETARY PERRY: I'm very positive about Russia joining the Partnership for Peace. It broadens it to include basically all the Eurasia countries as well as the United States and Canada. And it's just a major step forward. Now, Russia, of all of the countries that are being considered to join the Partnership for Peace, Russia, of course, is the largest, and has the most resources. It will bring the most to bear on the Partnership for Peace. So we are delighted that they are going to join. We have not yet seen the proposal it is sending to NATO. And the proposal will describe the extent of the commitment they're making. This is a large country with many resources and, therefore, they might make a very large commitment in terms of the number of troops they're committing for training, for example. We hope that they will make a large commitment and that this proposal will be a fulsome proposal.

Q. Do you foresee that they might offer a lot of peacekeeping troops -- do you see the possibility of that?

SECRETARY PERRY: I don't know what they are going to propose in terms of the number of troops for peacekeeping generally or specifically in Bosnia. They have a very great concern with peacekeeping in nations around the border of Russia, and I would expect that their first emphasis would be in dealing with those problems.

Q. When you mentioned this morning to Mr. Chernomyrdin about a special role for Russia in the partnership, would it be just merely this -- that they're larger and have more troops -- or is there anything else that you can concede more influence in the way decisions are made?

SECRETARY PERRY: To a certain extent every country who joins the Partnership for Peace is special. There is a set of conditions for joining the Partnership for Peace which all

countries have to agree to. Those conditions include a willingness to have an openness in what they are doing in defense, share their information with other countries, include a commitment to democracy. Those are broad conditions that all nations joining the Partnership for Peace have to meet. But each nation tailors its own proposals in the Partnership for Peace, and because Russia is a much larger nation with more resources, we would expect that their proposal will involve a much more extensive commitment and a much more extensive involvement than other nations will be able to. So it's not that special rules are being created for them. It's just that their very size allows them to be special, if they choose to be. And until we see their proposal we can't be sure what it is they are proposing.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how do you compare what your Russian counterparts are doing and facing in the way of defense pressure, cuts, and the element of hedging against future downturns of international situations that you talked about in your speech versus what you're facing?

SECRETARY PERRY: Well, in some sense they are similar. We had over a ten-year period roughly a 60% cut in defense procurement. And that is a substantial impact on our defense industry. President Yeltsin has announced that they have about a 70% cut in what he calls "orders to the defense industry," which I would interpret to mean like our procurement account.

Q. Over the same period?

SECRETARY PERRY: Over a somewhat shorter period. We started our downturn earlier than they did. But I think that's deceptive, making that comparison, because as difficult as it is for our companies to do defense conversion, the people in our defense companies at least are able to move into an economy which is much stronger than the Russian economy. So the companies and the people affected by this downturn in Russia have a double problem. They have the problem of the very dramatic decrease in defense resources, but at the same time they don't have an established commercial set of companies and infrastructure into which to go. So their problem is very much difficult. Add to that the absence of the financial infrastructure which you have already mentioned and you see a much more difficult problem that they are facing. So I would say Mr. Grachev's problems are much more difficult than the ones I face in that regard.

Q. Since we are approaching the end of our time on camera, I would like to ask you a three-part question. Could you please give us a brief answer to each one of these. First of all, how concerned are you about Russia's actions in the so-called near abroad -- the staging of troops and building bases. Do you think it goes beyond just their sphere of influence? To what extent does that concern you?

SECRETARY PERRY: We understand Russia's concerns about (inaudible) in countries bordering the boundaries of Russia. We very much believe that they should respect the independence of these countries and that when they provide assistance, they are providing assistance at the request of the other governments or at the United Nations mandate.

Q. On the subject of Korea, given the action of the North Koreans the past week or so, will the United States and South Korea (a) consider resuming the Team Spirit exercises, or (b) sending in those Patriot missile batteries, or (c) some other sort of sanctions?

SECRETARY PERRY: We already began discussion with South Korea and other Allies about the appropriate reaction to the announcements we have already heard from the IAEA. What remains to be seen yet, what the United Nations action is going to be, and certainly our response and South Korea's response will depend on that as well as our own considerations. Yes, we will consider a multitude of actions including the ones that you described.

Q. One last question on Bosnia — as you suggested before perhaps Maglaj might be a candidate for some sort of air power. Has that progressed anymore since the last time we talked? Is there any consideration at this point?

SECRETARY PERRY: There is no consideration being given to the use of air power to protect Maglaj at this stage. The UN has already sent observers into Maglaj, there are more UN ground troops that could be available there. There are many other steps that need to be taken in Maglaj before one could even consider the use of air power to protect the population there.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did the Ames case come up at all in your discussion with Grachev and others? Did you ask him to give you a list of what Ames gave him?

SECRETARY PERRY: No.

Q. So the matter has not been discussed?

SECRETARY PERRY: No.

Q. Have you talked with your own NATO colleagues about Russia joining the Partnership for Peace — I mean, since this thing came about.

SECRETARY PERRY: Not in the last day or two, but I've discussed it extensively with NATO colleagues in previous months.

Q. Was there a feeling that the Partnership for Peace not so much wouldn't go very far, but really wouldn't be very important, wouldn't loom very large without Russia as a member.

SECRETARY PERRY: No, we could conceive a Partnership for Peace without Russia. It stands on its own feet. I think that almost irrespective of which countries join it, as long as some significant member, central and eastern European country joins, it will be a successful venture. It will be more successful — more meaningful — with Russia joining, but that was not a central feature for its success.

Q. Were you pleased to have the (inaudible) say that they were putting no conditions at all on membership on Russia?

SECRETARY PERRY: Yes.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the Prime Minister mentioned we weren't able to get all that we said there, but he mentioned that you came close to, I think he was talking about agreement or framework on the issue of biological and chemical weapons. Can you describe what that element of discussion was?

SECRETARY PERRY: I stressed to the Prime Minister the importance which we attach to getting rid of the chemical weapons and the biological weapons and having satisfactory means of confirming that that's been done. Also I offered him assistance in the area of getting those facilities closed down and cleaned up. He was thankful for that offer of assistance and he suggested that at the next Gore-Chernomyrdin meeting, which will be probably in June in the Washington area, that that ought to be a major item on the agenda to discuss particular implementing plans. I gather that they have already agreed in principle to get in rhythm in biological and chemical (audible). It's now a question of implementation and verification and schedule -- timing. Is there an offer of assistance and a dollar amount?

SECRETARY PERRY: No. We already are providing some assistance to the chemical clean-up under the Nunn-Lugar program. Some funds have already been committed in that category or activity.

Q. Mr. Secretary, yesterday a member of the Duma likened the Partnership for Peace to (inaudible) his country. On the flight over here you talked about the sense of some nationalistic defense conversion (inaudible). In the last two days here have you got a sense -- are you folks really at the margin, and diminishing day by day or are these sort of sentiments growing and something that needs to be addressed by us -- by the American side?

SECRETARY PERRY: First of all let me say that in my discussions with all of the government officials I talked with, not only the ones I named, but a good many sub-cabinet officials, that I found nothing but strong support for what we are doing in Defense Conversion and for the Partnership for Peace -- uniformly strong support. I also had a meeting as you know yesterday afternoon at the Duma with I guess 8 or 10 Duma members including Mr. Ryekin and I got a mixed view there. Some of them were open and supportive of these issues, others were much more skeptical. So, I think we'll find a representation of views in the Duma including some very negative views. One of the reasons I went to the Duma is I wanted to give them an American perspective of why we thought these programs were not only useful for America but useful for Russia as well. And I used this concept which we discussed before -- pragmatic partnership -- to explain why it was we thought these programs were useful for the United States and Russia simultaneously. We see critics both in the United States and Russia who seem to believe that anything that's good for one country is bad for the other country and vice versa. And I made a very strong point at the Duma that many of the (inaudible) that these programs were proceeding on were mutually beneficial.

Q. You said some of the folks were skeptical. Does that imply that they still believe in our good faith or were there people there who thought that it was a plot?

SECRETARY PERRY: Well of the eight or ten people that I talked with in Duma I didn't think it was any question of good faith. It was a very congenial meeting. They were very much interested in hearing what I had to say and they listened very attentively. They offered criticism on some points, but there was no rancor and no question of good faith at all. These are only eight or ten people and there are many other members of the Duma. But these are very influential people. These are the Chairman of the Defense Committee, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Speaker -- so these are major leaders in the Duma.

Q. Were their criticisms random or was there a theme to them? I mean what was their persistent, if any, criticism?

SECRETARY PERRY: The ones who were critical, and not all of them were, I would say the underlying theme was that they were skeptical that a program could be both beneficial to the United States and to Russia at the same time. They were (inaudible). What was good for us must be bad for Russia.

Q. And consequently if you were here selling it as good for the Americans, ergo, it's bad for us?

SECRETARY PERRY: That was the underlying theme that I got, and what I tried to do is discuss these programs on their merits and explain why I thought they were good for the Russians and they listened very attentively. I might even have converted a few. It's hard to tell.

Q. Back to the subject of hedging, how would you describe things that Russia is doing to protect itself. Would you describe some of the things the United States is doing to increase the weapons programs (inaudible).

SECRETARY PERRY: First of all they are trying to keep alive -- keep open -- some of their key defense industrial facilities. Just as we are in the United States. They continue to produce nuclear attack submarines just as we are continuing a low rate production of nuclear attack submarines. And I believe for much the same reasons that we're doing it, which is to maintain that facility. They continue to maintain a development and production of ICBMs, which we are not doing. We are developing and producing submarine ballistic missiles, but we do not have any ICBM program in production. And they are trying very hard to maintain their R&D program. I think they are not doing as well in that regard as we. That is, their funding has decreased substantially in supporting the defense R&D whereas we have been able to maintain our funding levels at a pretty good level in defense R&D. But conceptually the problems are similar. The particular things they are doing are different in detail from what we are doing. They have made a major reduction in the number of people in their Armed Forces -- the percentage change is much greater than the change in the United States. They are down to about the same size in active duty military

as we are today. They have been able to maintain their readiness to the extent that we have been able to maintain in the United States.

Q. May I quickly follow up on that? I may have my figure off by a billion or two, but I recall reading a story on the Russian defense budget (inaudible) \$1B for their budget compared to \$263B for the United States. What would you call it beyond that gap?

SECRETARY PERRY: I've seen figures like that before. I don't know how to trust those figures. Not so much because I think people are being deceptive, but because the comparability is very very difficult to determine. They have a conscript army, not a professional army, so adding comparability and costs is almost impossible.

Q. Were the people that you met with basically optimistic or basically pretty grim and that sort of state about their future?

SECRETARY PERRY: They have very turbulent times going on in Russia today. And that was evident in everybody that I talked with. Some of them maintained optimism. Others didn't project what I would call optimism but they projected a certain resilience. And I was quite impressed with that.

Thank you sir.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY
REMARKS AT CEREMONY AT SIGNING OF PROTOCOL ON COOPERATION IN IMPLEMENTING
CERTAIN DEFENSE CONVERSION PROJECTS, WITH REMARKS OF OTHER OFFICIALS
MOSCOW, RUSSIA
MARCH 18, 1994

FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF THE ECONOMY MIKHAILOV: Ladies and gentlemen. Right now we are prepared to summarize the results of the session of the Russian-US Committee on Defense Conversion which was created as a result of the decision that was taken by the Premier of Russia, Mr. Chernomyrdin and Vice President of the United States Al Gore.

The day and one-half that we have spent working on these issues have shown that we've reached a full mutual understanding with regard to the approaches to the taking on of joint conversion projects.

We have chosen four of the most important and largest of defense projects, and we have proposed a number of projects. With regard to these enterprises we have discussed them, we have presented them to the US side so the US could review the possibility of funding them under the Nunn-Lugar Amendment.

The total number of enterprises that are being considered is over forty and there is an additional nineteen enterprises we're preparing projects for and they will be sent to the US side for its consideration.

I would like to especially stress that we are not talking about assistance here. We are talking about cooperation.

One of the packages of projects includes such subject areas as satellites, electronics, communication equipment, housing construction, construction materials, air traffic control systems, automated ticket systems for air companies, and a number of others.

Naturally government support cannot account for all the funding that will be necessary for these projects, so private industry, private businesses will have to play a special role in funding these projects.

In this connection we expect that a conference which will be held next week will be successful. This conference will include business leaders and experts in various fields from our enterprises and from US industry. They will all have a chance to meet directly, discuss a number of projects and reach final agreement on these projects.

This session of the Joint US-Russian Committee on Conversion took place in an atmosphere that was exceptionally friendly. It was marked by a great degree of mutual understanding, and all of the participants went out of their way to try and understand all of

the details of the projects that had been discussed and what was said in order to finalize an agreement as quickly as possible.

In conclusion, I would just like to thank all of the participants and especially thank Dr. Perry and also

Mr. Kokoshin, Mr. Barry Carter, and the other participants, and we're sure that this step that was taken as a result of this session will bring us good results.

I think I have taken up enough time. I would like to leave enough time for questions, so I'll stop now.

MR. BARRY CARTER, US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: It is my honor to serve as the US Vice Chair on the Defense Diversification Committee, and I would like to introduce to you, if you do not know him already, the Secretary of Defense William J. Perry.

SECRETARY PERRY: Thank you Barry. The four of us at this table have been working for the last six or seven months to reach the point which would come today. During this six or seven months we have been discussing, laying plans, making agreements, and we have finally come up with a set of agreements that not only are going to provide projects of great benefit to Russia, but they will be of benefit to American companies as well.

This day marks a great landmark in that it divides all of the time up until now, which has been talking and agreeing and discussing, and everything that happens from now on, which is going to be acting — creating projects, developing products, building housing. All of that is ahead of us and we are ready to begin it now.

FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION KOKOSHIN: I failed to introduce my predecessor, Mr. Mikhailov, who is the First Deputy Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation for the Economy.

Following what's been said by my predecessors and my American colleagues as well, I can only add that indeed we've approached our subject matters in a constructive way and a most businesslike manner and we hope that what's going to be by way of implementation is not going to (inaudible) us to some gigantic vast project, but let's hope that there will be some tangible results and there will be pragmatic and realistic results.

MODERATOR: The document that's being signed is the "Agreement to the Protocol on Cooperation in the Implementation of certain Defense Conversion Projects."
The initial document was December 16, 1993.

SECRETARY PERRY: I would just comment that there are two signatures missing on this document that symbolically should be here, and those are Senator Nunn and Senator Lugar who sponsored the legislation that makes this entire program possible.

MODERATOR: Why don't we open the conference to questions from the press and the media.

Q. Mr. Defense Secretary. Now that Russia is about to take part in the Partnership for Peace Program, what does it mean for America?

SECRETARY PERRY: The Partnership for Peace Program stands to benefit not only NATO nations, not only the nations that joined the Partnership for Peace, but indeed the whole world because it presents the opportunity to introduce peace and stability into the Eurasian region and provides a mechanism for peacekeeping in troubled areas around the world. So it benefits the United States and Russia and other countries equally.

Q. Mr. Secretary of Defense. Russia has been asking for some considerable concessions to join the Partnership for Peace. I wonder if you can comment on whether any of those will be conceded and if there is a date that is firmed up for them to join. The end of the month is talked about as the date firmed up.

SECRETARY PERRY: I am not aware of any concessions being asked for Russia to join the Partnership for Peace. Both Minister Grachev and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin told the press yesterday and today that Russia is now preparing the documents proposed to become a member of the Partnership for Peace. These documents will describe the manner in which Russia wants to participate. Each country that wants to become a member of the Partnership for Peace can describe the extent to which they want to participate -- how many troops they want to make available to the Partnership for Peace, what kind of training they want to participate in. So to a certain extent each country that joins the Partnership for Peace will tailor its own plan. Since Russia is by far the largest country that would be joining the Partnership for Peace and has certainly the greatest military, I would expect that their plan would involve a much greater commitment than some of the other countries, but I have not seen their plan yet so I can't comment specifically on that.

I might add on an additional point. The Nunn-Lugar Agreement beside providing the funds for this Defense Conversion Program also provides a substantially larger number of funds for facilitating the destruction and the clean-up associated with weapons and mass destruction. All of you are familiar with the Trilateral Agreement made in Moscow involving the dismantling of nuclear weapons in Ukraine. We have been working for a number of months with Russia on a program to assist in the dismantling and the clean-up of chemical weapons, and associated with that we just signed an agreement in that regard and I have asked Dr. Duffy who is sitting in the audience who just concluded that agreement to briefly describe to you what that consists of.

DR. DUFFY: The United States and Russia both are faced with the burden of destroying thousands of tons of chemical agent and chemical munitions. The US Defense Department is engaged in an effort to provide step-by-step assistance to Russia in carrying out this task. Today we have concluded an agreement from Nunn-Lugar funds for \$30

million in assistance for the establishment of a central analytical chemistry laboratory through the Academy of Sciences here in Russia that will be established at the Bernatskiy Institute. The laboratory will do research and conduct tests and experiments on the safe and ecologically sound disposal of chemical munitions, and we are pleased to announce this chemical agreement from Nunn-Lugar funds from the US Defense Department as well as the Defense Conversion Agreement.

MODERATOR: By the way there is a statement regarding the Signing Ceremony today about the background on the Nunn-Lugar Amendment that was signed here today. I assume it's over at the press table. We have some copies here today. On behalf of all my colleagues I would like to thank you very much and hope you enjoy your time here.

END

WASHINGTON POST

Mar. 19, 1994

Pg. 16

Pitch for 'Pragmatic Partnership'

Perry's New Mantra Seeks to Reassure Both Americans, Russians

By Fred Hiatt

Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, March 18—Defense Secretary William J. Perry left Moscow today after repeatedly invoking a new mantra of U.S.-Russian relations: "pragmatic partnership."

The phrase, rooted in growing skepticism in Washington about U.S. aid to Russia, is intended to reassure

NEWS
ANALYSIS

Americans that helping Russia is ultimately in their interest too.

Throughout Perry's visit, there was no talk of idealism, shared values or generosity, only of calculated self-interest on both sides.

Several observers said that Perry succeeded, during his brief visit, in showing that the fragile bilateral partnership is producing rewards for both sides.

But the visit also underscored a dilemma in the new approach: As American domestic pressure forces the Clinton administration to invoke U.S. interests to justify aid to Russia, Russians grow ever more suspicious of U.S. motives. That suspicion and disillusionment, in turn, may reduce whatever small influence Washington has over the stormy political change taking place here.

"It appears that Western democrats have given up all their hopes of seeing Russia become a democratic state," an article in the weekly newspaper Literaturnaya Gazeta said this week in an increasingly typical comment. "Their main concern today is to achieve any kind of geopolitical control they can over the new Russian regime."

Perry thus had to persuade Russians that he wasn't here only to help America—while persuading Americans that he wasn't just helping Russia, either. On Thursday, Perry won a promise from his Russian counterpart, Pavel Grachev, that Russia will join NATO's Partnership for Peace program by the end of the month, a move that might quiet some Western fears about Russia's superpower ambitions.

Today Perry signed an agreement to allocate \$20 million to promote the conversion of Russian arms makers to civilian production. Again, U.S. officials stressed the mutual advantages, since all money will be channeled through U.S. companies forming joint ventures here.

Such assurances are understandable, given growing doubts in Congress about sending money to Russia when Moscow seems

increasingly truculent and uncooperative.

But both the rhetoric and the aid flow bolster those here who say that U.S. aid is intended only to weaken Russia while enriching American capitalists. Many here believe, for example, that Washington is helping to fund the denuclearization of the former Soviet Union to enhance the United States' status as sole remaining superpower.

Such attitudes were badly exemplified this week by Vladimir Lukin, former Russian ambassador to Washington, when he likened the NATO partnership program to a "rape" of Russia. But Lukin, generally considered a centrist, is far from alone. A recent article in the liberal-centrist newspaper Nezavisimaya Gazeta suggested that Washington is intent on "methodically ousting Russia" from Central Asia and the Caucasus, another widely held perception.

Perry, who met with a group of Russian legislators Thursday, acknowledged that while some were very positive about the relationship, others were highly skeptical.

"The skepticism, it seemed to me,

was like some of the skepticism we hear from critics in the U.S.," Perry said, adding that he delivered the same message to skeptics in both countries: "It's not that we are doing favors for Russia or that Russia is doing favors for us. We are undertaking joint programs which we believe are in our mutual interest."

"Critics don't seem to believe that it's possible to do things that are mutually beneficial," he added. "They look at it as zero-sum, that if it's beneficial to one country it must be harmful to the other."

Perry rejected such criticism as vintage Cold War thinking. U.S. officials hope the new rhetoric of pragmatic partnership can persuade Congress to keep funding U.S. aid to Russia for what Perry called "the advancement of United States national security interests."

At the same time, U.S. officials hope to reach out to "moderate nationalists" here who understand that Moscow no longer can be seen to be blindly following Washington, but who also know that Russia cannot succeed without Western aid.

Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev, an early proponent of close ties who has recently remade himself into such a pragmatic nationalist, recently said "there is no reasonable alternative to partnership if we really want to create a democratic Russian state." Kozyrev, like Perry, saw parallels in the opposition in both countries.

"Only reactionary forces in the military-industrial complex and the bureaucracy of both countries would like to thwart our partnership," the foreign minister recently wrote in the daily newspaper Izvestia. "They come up with fictitious ideas of Russia being doomed to totalitarianism and confrontation with the rest of

the world. . . . In reality, we have to move further to practical partnership."

But Kozyrev warned that if the two countries fail to deepen such a partnership, the "doomsayers" will take advantage.

The uncertain mood in Russia was reflected today in a joking newspaper headline reporting plans to hold joint U.S.-Russian military peacekeeping exercises on the Volga River this summer.

"AMERICAN TANKS WILL SOON BE IN RUSSIA," the lead headline in Moskovsky Komsomolets reported, and then added in smaller letters: "It's Not Yet Time to Run to Save Yourself."